

REMARKS

Introduction

No claims have been amended. The application continues to include claims 1, 5-11 and 15-21. Reconsideration of the rejection of the application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

The Claims are Allowable at least because the Prior Art Fails to Disclose Cell-Based Data Processing in which a Specification includes a Plurality of Interlocking Cells as Defined

Claims 1, 5-11, 15-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over “XML Path language (Xpath)” and “XSL Transformation (XSLT) Version 1.0 (W3C Recommendation 16 November 1999)” (collectively, “W3C”). Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested at least because the prior art fails to disclose cell-based data processing in which a specification includes a plurality of interlocking cells as defined.

Embodiments of the present invention provide a novel structure of formatting computer code that will be executed by a computer to provide ease of use in the computer programming environment. The structure includes a single sheet with a number of discrete cells, each delineated by a beginning and ending tag. The cells are interlocked because either an attribute or formula of a cell may reference another cell. This novel structure simplifies software development.

The present claims recite limitations, consistent with the present specification, that specifically define the structure of each cell. For example, referring only to some

limitations of claim 1 (and ignoring the limitations in the dependent claims), each cell must:

1. include “a formula specifying an action or computation to perform when the cell is executed”;
2. include “one or more attributes referencing other cells, wherein the formula of a first cell may reference a value of a second cell”;
3. be “delineated by a beginning and ending tag”;
4. “one of the cells is reserved as an output cell for outputting a result of the processing”; and
5. be “interlocked with at least one other cell through the formula or attribute of each cell”.

W3C is a specification that defines the syntax and semantics of XSL transformation (“XLST”), which is a language for transforming XML documents into other XML documents. In the Office Action, broad portions of W3C are cited that supposedly disclose each of the above limitations for the claimed cells. However, these portions merely provide some aspects of the W3C language, but do not specifically meet the claimed limitations, as required.

First, it is not clear from the Office Action what is even being referred to as a “cell” in W3C. The Office Action states that the cell is disclosed as a “source tree”, “set of template rules”, “template instantiated for a particular source element”, etc. See

Office Action at p. 2. Therefore, a single element is not considered a “cell”, and certainly no single element in W3C includes any or all of the above limitations.

A discussion of the application of the Office Action to the above limitations illustrates the inadequacy of the rejection:

1. [include “a formula specifying an action or computation to perform when the cell is executed”] --The Office Action cites to “template rules” and sec. 5.4 pg. 21-22 and sec. 7.6.1, pg. 36. See Office Action at p. 2. However, sec. 5.4 merely discloses how to “apply template rules” and Sec. 7.6.1 discloses “Generating Text” Neither of these sections disclose requiring that a “cell” includes a “formula”.
2. [include “one or more attributes referencing other cells, wherein the formula of a first cell may reference a value of a second cell”]--The Office Action cites to secs. 11.2 - 11.6 of W3C. See Office Action at p. 3. These sections relate to the value of variable and parameters. They do not disclose including attributes in one cell referencing another cell, and using a formula to provide the referencing.
3. [be “delineated by a beginning and ending tag”]--The Office Action cites to secs. 7.6.1 and 11.6. See Office Action at p. 3. There is nothing in these sections that disclose beginning and ending tags to define a cell.
4. [“one of the cells is reserved as an output cell for outputting a result of the processing”]--The Office Action cites to various disclosures of the word

“output” in W3C. However, there is no disclosure of a specific “cell” as defined in the claim, that is reserved as an output cell.

5. [be “interlocked with at least one other cell through the formula or attribute of each cell”]. The Office Action cites to secs. 7.6.1 and 7.6.2. See Office Action at p. 4. Sec. 7.6.1 is directed to generating text. Sec. 7.6.2 is directed to attribute value templates. Neither of these sections disclose a requirement that each “cell” is interlocked with another cell.

In summary, merely pointing out broad sections of the W3C specification, without pointing specifically to a disclosure of each word of each of the limitations does not support a prima facie case of invalidity. Applicants respectfully request that “all words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art” as required by MPEP ¶ 2143.01. Therefore, Applicants respectfully reconsideration of the rejection.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request favorable action in connection with this application.

The Examiner is invited and urged to contact the undersigned to discuss any matter concerning this application.

No fee should be required for this submission. Should any other fee be required, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any such fee to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 23, 2010

/Barry S. Goldsmith/

Barry S. Goldsmith
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 39,690

Customer No. 74739
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP
14TH Floor
8000 Towers Crescent Drive
Vienna, Virginia 22182-6212
Telephone: 703-720-7876
Fax: 703-720-7802